

***WAWF/UID/RFID***  
***Industry Meeting Agenda***  
***(Data Capture & Delivery)***

***May 9<sup>th</sup> - 10<sup>th</sup> , 2006***

***(notes/comments in orange)***



# **Dave Guinasso - WAWF**

*DCMA had 115K transactions last month, \$13 billion  
WAWF almost out of development and into sustaining mode.  
Not much new functionality is being added.*

*Last month,*

- 85% Receiving Reports processed electronically, goal is 93%*
- 91% Invoices processed electronically, goal is 95%*

*The move now is to move more transactions to being  
processed in WAWF - plan to turn off other input systems  
(WINS) over the next few years.*

*Limiting factor for WAWF changes is manpower resources.  
First priority is to add functionality to get more people on  
board, then can go back to do things to make current  
users happy. Need to get to point of Full Operational  
Capability.*

# LeAntha Sumpter - UID

## Top Issues

1. *Army numbers in the UID registry exceed the Air Force. Army has a 2 year window - they have a new level of acceptance. LeAntha will be putting pressure on Juan, Real problem is DoDAACS -- no rigor to management and consistency. Army is going to address.*
2. *January - kicked off a DoDAAC reengineering group. Problem to address is how to push updates through the systems. Found issues in the DoDAAC management practices.  
Cage code issue - contractors losing design authority (asked Abby Rothman for a white paper on this topic). DoDAAC is pivotal for deploying UID successfully*
3. *Policy synchronization - SES board of directors looking across ATL - finding issues across Service REGs, Inventory, financial, acquisition, each in their own do-loop. (RFID issue - we want a system implementation solution)*
4. *Contract consistency - currently pulling contracts and evaluating. Finding multiple problems. Bruce to lead group to analyze and create training module - gathering lessons learned from DFAS, procurement. Also would like industry input. Plan is to provide minimum rules for contract construction - more structure at higher levels, with flexibility at lower levels (CLIN construction). July is target date for delivery of module.*
5. *Navy strategy for UID - Program Plans - posting whether a program has a program plan. Y/N answer (close to locking down data structure for acquisition program UID)*
6. *Round of DEPOT days at Tinker AFB - invite PMs or OEMs - depot will roll out plan for UID implementation and invite input from PMs and OEMs to ensure all needs addressed.*
7. *Data entry into the Property system (AF equipment) - demo in July timeframe.*
8. *New registry requirement developed to indicate which system sent the UII information. Currently WAWF shown as the source, but may be others. Met with NII - when a system sends something we need to know what system sent it. WAWF will have a sys ID, document ID, The Dipper system registers all systems - can use that to create a sysUID. Question: are we going to identify the contractor sending system?*

# LeAnthia Sumpter - UID (continued)

## Discussion

1. **Services - how do I know if I'm going to get the Virtual ID from the services?**  
(Carolyn Tobin)

*Ultimate goal is that service should send us the UIIs. If we receive a legacy piece of property, it should be GFP; if it has had a virtual UID, it is supposed to be marked prior to custody transfer or change in location. That procedure needs to be established. Virtual UII is only meant as a tide over until you incur a "trigger" event (change in custody) to create the physical mark. An item with a virtual UII should be physically marked at time of change in custody by the custodian who created the UII, whether government or contractor. A virtual UII should never be updated except to change it to a physical UII.*

*Virtual UII - legacy - is still GFP. Should we use virtuals on those that will never be moved - no. Virtual UIIs are fine for items sitting in a depot, but once moved, needs to have physical mark applied.*

2. **Until services engage, difficult for DLA to engage. DLA contracts - putting UID in contracts**

# Lydia Dawson - GFP

1. *DFARS rule for eliminating DD1662 - published 3/21 (expect 2-3 months for final)*
2. *Reviewing and Synchronizing policy (20 Scenarios to drill down on)*
3. *30 niche property systems - OSD goal is to eliminate those systems. Eliminate the redundancy, gain consistency in WAWF, UID, PCARRS, LDD*
4. *Shipping function - making it a single process. Concern is that we'll expect the same level of record-keeping as UID - not so*
5. *What can we (OSD) leverage that is ongoing today in the contractor property management systems?*
6. *GFM parent/child process will meet Rick Sylvester's requirement to know total cost*
7. *Looking to leverage WAWF to eliminate labor-intensive parts of the process - example: GFP authorization to transfer goods from one contract to another...send a transaction to WAWF that would in turn issue a transaction to related systems.*
8. *Material and Bulk - Visibility and traceability of Material is a requirement - this will not have the same reporting requirements that UID has. (Pat J ) One AIA company has 95000 line items, 500000 pieces.*
9. *Industry group to focus on Material / Bulk requirements (Lydia/Pat ). Need to be sure that we engage the right material people...clearly understand what material is in question*
10. *Air Force will not use virtual UID, depends on program.*
11. *By 2010, all GFP has to be physically marked.*

# Government Furnished Property

## 1. Ull Construct

- a) Requirement of 78 characters

*Length of the Ull - going to the connector folks for their requirements, if not a large number we will reduce it to fit the NATO standard and ISO standard. GEIA pushed for the 78 length. 50 is what we would like. Of 200,000 in the registry only 2 are above 40 characters and they are mistakes.*

- b) Review of the Ull construction that the Services will use for Physical and Virtual 'marking'. (Pat Jacklets)

*Lydia requested clarification on this*

## 2. Trigger Events

- a) How are the Services addressing and planning for 'trigger events' and the marking of items?

*(see notes in Lydia's presentation)*

- b) Are there trigger events that they specifically believe will belong to the Contractors? Therefore we will do the marking. If so, will there be items that are both with and without Virtual Ulls?

*(see notes in Lydia's presentation)*

# Government Furnished Property (2)

## **3. Ull Identified**

- a) *When we get the piece of GFE will the DD1348 identify the item as having a Physical Ull or Virtual Ull and possibly have the Ull printed on the paperwork? (We sure don't want to search the Registry on every piece of GFE that shows up on our dock.)*

*Business rule states government is to furnish existing Ulls when shipping under a contract. That does not mean that they will, but they are required to do so.*

# Bruce Propert - UID Registry

## **1. Registry Stats**

- a) 192000 items in registry, of which 162000 are new procurement items**
- b) Compliance by service - Air Force in best shape**

## **2. Contract language survey of 9382 supply contracts from June - July, 2005**

- a) Looked for UID clause - 25% had the clause**

## **3. Registry**

- a) Two releases in last 6 months**
- b) Release 3.3 - November 2006 - add more data elements to track life cycle, provide more reporting, create API to check UID construct**

## **4. Registry User training - should be incorporated into the UID training process**

## **5. Working on First Draft on storing Warranty data**

## **6. Embedded items**

- a) Biggest draw to government on embedded items is maintenance data**
- b) Need to form an industry team to develop reporting alternatives**



# UID Registry Questions

## **1. UID PMO Questions (James Clark)**

- a) *What's a reasonable volume for parent/child data submissions via an 856?*

*Query industry members on a reasonable number of children to and end item.*

- b) *When does it get too large or require other means of reporting?*

*Data is due to maintenance systems*

*Involves a DID (as-built baseline)*

*Data structure will be standardized for as-built/as-maintained. Do we use WAWF to deliver part of this data?*

*SM Business - two processes are a heavy burden to implement if you are a SM business.*

*FOCUS group to research this - opportunities, potential solutions*

*Embedded data - Curt Garcia (lead), Greg T, Evelyn Thompson,*

*Tony (Drake?), Bill Zirkel, Susan Pucelik(?)*

# UID Registry Questions (continued)

## **1. UID PMO questions (continued)**

- c) *We are starting to consider the warranty issues and what it would require to add warranty tracking capability to the Registry (e.g., what data elements are required). Any input from the group would be helpful.***
  
- d) *What else do people want the Registry to do? This is more open ended, but will help us in planning upcoming releases.***

# **RFID Security Focus Group**

***Brian Aldridge, MilPac***

***Greg Tsiknas, MilPac***

***Pat Funke, Boeing***

***Pat Jacklets***

***Cindy Finucan***

***Evelyn Thompson***

***Curt Garcia***

***Claudine Dupere***

***Abby Rothman***

***Ted Rust***

***Tony Drake, iMobile***

***Tony Davis, WAWF PM***

***Tito Maldonado, DCMA***

***Greg Letiecq, WFI***

# **Topics for Discussion**

# WAWF

## **Change of format of the email responses in version 3.0.10**

- a) **Are the sample email changes final? (Bill Zirkel)**

**Tony Davis - email formats are final pending results of OAT II testing. He has asked CACI to give a one page summary for industry. Samples will be made available.**

## **WAWF new release 3.0.10**

**Release date is June 12<sup>th</sup>. Request made to push date back due to month-end financials. Not possible since existing development contract expires 6/30 and time needed for fixes to this release prior to that. Tony Davis said that more testing has been done on this release; he has a higher confidence factor on the success of this release. The June 12 date also lines up with GFP policy update to DFARS.**

**Vendors expressed appreciation for opportunity to test 3.0.10**

**3.11 Tentative Release Date is March, 2007**

**?? Curt - supporting 1149 will we make that date? Public comment closes May 22<sup>nd</sup>.**

## **DD250 withholds and WAWF submissions (Dwayne Holland)**

- a) **Withholds - have developed procedures for entering withholds for Berry Amendment. Plan review with DFAS to apply same procedures to all withholds. Target is end of June.**
- b) **Procedural changes also in progress to handle negative amounts and avoid overpayment**

## **WAWF Production/GEX Administration**

- a) **GEX failover - When the failover exercise is performed WAWF is impacted in some way. When can we expect the failover process to be error-free? (DISA routinely practices cooping which is switching processing from their Ogden site to Columbus site to emulate a natural disaster and to practice 'continuity of operations'. )**

**Tony Davis -- Issue is architectural; EDA has same issues. Challenged engineering staff to come up with a solution.**

**Disaster Recovery - working to have Columbus back available in June/July (Columbus hardware moved to Ogden to help with response issues last summer). (Right**

# WAWF continued

## 4. WAWF Production/GEX Administration (continued)

- b) Data often gets delayed in processing both in and out of WAWF and duplicate documents get sent causing problems and payment delays. Is there a checklist at DISA to follow and a process to learn from the mistakes to ensure these types of things are not repeated?

**Feedback concerning these issues - Best industry feedback is DISA customer support. ALWAYS start with a trouble ticket. If no or unsatisfactory response call Tony Davis. Bobby Moon will accept calls on this.**

- c) The Hardware Signing Module is an internal part of WAWF. In the past, when the HSM went down documents went to an "invalid" status. While that problem seems to have been addressed, new documents fail to extract when HSM goes down. Is a better technical solution in the works and if so, what is it and when will it be put in place?

**Found a problem in the HSM product - patch will be delivered from Vendor in May.**

## 5. Invoicing

- a) What is the process for handling the following type of rejection? "Reason for rejection: This contract does not contain a WAWF invoice clause. Please submit a paper invoice." (Sandra Perrin)

**No WAWF Invoice clause exists. For MOCAS paid contracts, send to Dave. Contact Ed Tuorinsky for Navy contracts paid in OnePay. OnePay payment system requires "ecoding" to process electronically. Navy assistance in all WAWF issues -- 800-559-WAWF**

- b) Some DLA offices are not loading their contracts and modifications into EDA. What is being done to ensure that all DOD agencies are using EDA for their Contracts and Modifications?

**Dave needs examples. DLA Larger contracts were not going to post in EDA. Dave and Bruce will push this issue up. Navy intends to put all contracts into EDA. Should allow 3 days to get a mod posted to EDA - working toward an automated solution.**

- c) There are some DoD contracts that are not "MOCAS Administered". Do contractors use WAWF (causes recycle report errors)? If so, how do these get removed from the Recycle report?

**Should use WAWF for non-MOCAS administered. "Recycle report" refers to DCMA administration.**

- d) When will Vendors have the capability to create and save a document in WAWF without having to immediately process it?

**That is not scheduled as a requirement - evaluated but don't believe technically feasible, given underlying architecture. Template option offered instead.**

- e) When will vendors have reporting capabilities from WAWF?

# WAWF (continued)

## 5. Invoicing (continued)

f) When will vendors have correction capabilities in WAWF?

*For post-signature corrections, pricing item is a MOCAS change (WAWF could handle; MOCAS cannot). Waiting for the MOCAS rehost; in meantime, not making changes to MOCAS. Dave will take a look at sending corrections to WAWF, then have users do paper from that point on.*

g) Does WAWF accept DD1348 forms?

*Dave - it will process, it will not look like the paper form. If that's being asked as an acceptance document, then the answer is yes - WAWF has acceptance document capability.*

h) Curt - what do the different roles see in WAWF documents ?

*Government sees documents same as vendor sees them. CLIN and ACRN tabs on Performance Based payments are used differently. ACO approves events, and must have ACRN tab filled out prior to signature. Not mandatory by regulation for contractor to fill out ACRN tab. DFAS is recorder of ACRN breakout. Dave has requested examples and will ask that it get in their desktop procedures.*

# Registry Reporting

## **1. Phil Northrop Assessment**

### **a) Single Item Query**

**works but is still case sensitive**

### **b) Contract Query**

**I am now guessing that query is for production items and not GFP as it is still looking at the acquiring contract number.**

### **c) GFP Custody Query Contract**

**is not case sensitive and dashes not required when inputting a contract number. This query works on contracts where the number of items is low (5 to 30) ,,when you try contracts with over 100 items it times out (Get Page not displayed screen)**

### **d) GFP Custody Query by CAGE/DUNS**

**Still comes up with DUNS number filled in and does not allow you to change to Cage as query would indicate. Query produces only "No Records Found"**

### **e) REPORTING GFP By Contract**

**output "Contract not Available" Tried all upper case , lower case with dashes without dashes**

### **f) GFP Summary By Contractor**

**Search by DUNS Number creates report but report is Blank**

**Search by Cage code timed out this week but last**



# RFID

## **1. Multiple boxes for one CLIN shipment**

- a) **At the last WAWF/UID/RFID meeting in December, Raytheon brought up the issue of what to do when you have one item that requires multiple cases to ship and therefore multiple RFID tags (Dell computer). (Nancy Robinson)**

**Still working to find resolution. For now, you need to work out with ship-to location to agree on how to do it. Two issues are involved: a) how to tag the containers and b) how to document the tags in WAWF. Need to document all variations on the problem here - so we can discuss. Need resolution on tagging issue, then can/will change WAWF. Focus group needed to work on this - defining shipping variations and business processes.**

## **2. What do we do if we have a contract with an RFID requirement that cannot be submitted via WAWF? (E Thompson)**

**(I can't find any notes that we discussed this)**

## **3. RFID Processing of Consolidated (Multi-Contract) Shipments (Greg Tsiknas)**

- a) **How do Depots handle consolidated containers/pallets (read as a pallet, or broken down and read at case level)?**
- b) **Can Depot handle multiple RFID Pallet Tags on the same container (one for each contract/shipment within)?**

**(I can't find any notes that we discussed this)**

# To be addressed at ILAG

- 1. Flowing down IUID requirements for Supplier part number items that are uniquely military. Ideally, any Prime that buys them will be requiring IUID on the items and the Supplier will roll the dash numbers to incorporate IUID and quit selling the prior dash numbers. How? (Carolyn Tobin)*
- 2. ILAG... Can we resurrect the DCMA quality "guidance" document (see attached) and get this on the agenda as a discussion item? It needs updating, but we also need to get it into use within DCMA. (Andy Jay)*

# Focus Group - Paper Invoices

## 1. **Invoices having withholds or deductions - except Berry**

*Because of Berry amendment, DFAS and DCMA have come up with agreement on how to do in WAWF - bill at net unit price - in CLIN description, enter original amount plus deduct. At DFAS, invoice goes to IAI status so will trigger manual review. Evaluating over next 90 days to see if will work for all.*

## 2. **Withhold release**

## 3. **Credit invoice**

## 4. **Locations / Acceptors that are not active in WAWF**

## 5. **Classified Invoices**

*WAWF was not intended for true classified invoices. There are some classified contracts where the invoices are not classified.*

## 6. **Grants / Cooperative Agreements**

*These will possibly be addressed in 3.0.11 - route the invoices to ACO instead of directly to DCAA. DCMA administered invoices addressed in 3.0.9.*

## 7. **Invoices with fractional (decimal) quantities**

*This problem is a payment system issue; WAWF stops the transaction where the payment system cannot handle. Decimal quantities are allowed for IAPS. MOCAS rehost will fix the MOCAS issue. In the meantime, MOCAS can be worked around by changing the unit of measure - example: change hours to minutes. Then bill in 15-minute increments.*

## 8. **Invoices requiring COR/COTR signature**

*Issue here is getting more folks on board. COTRs are now approvers, so can do approvals in WAWF.*

## 9. **Invoices requiring CofC (service invoices)**

*Dave would like an example to work with. Dave will investigate doing as combo - also try as commercial with attachment. Look at new procedure. Change in 3.0.9 made this possible.*

# Industry Enhancement Vote

(Dave's comments in orange below)

<b>Total /</b>	<b>Enhancement</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>139</b>	<b>Send a corrected transaction via EDI/FTP in addition to using recall/void and resubmit (before accepted in WAWF)</b>	<b>To support integrated environments - the ability to send a corrected transaction ensures that data in contractor application and in WAWF match.</b> <b>Investigating - very hard to change invoice once in payment system. May be possible for an unsigned RR. Add automated recall (put a hold on a document when loaded to WAWF instead of just flowing through to payment system, to allow opportunity for attachments)</b>
<b>132</b>	<b>Return a Structured file transaction (EDI 824/864, FTP) to the contractor for all email notifications currently received</b>	<b>Contractors need a structured file in addition to email for timeliness and reliability. A file would allow the ability to feed updates automatically to business applications and further automate our processes. Don't know where this item is currently prioritized - can use O&amp;M money once WAWF gets to maintenance</b>
<b>127</b>	<b>Ability to process invoices/RRs involving withholds or deductions</b>	<b>Currently these receiving reports and invoices must be processed manually, delaying payment. Resolved for MOCAS</b>
<b>96</b>	<b>Support for UID embedded items</b>	<b>WAWF UID support only allows input of IUIDs on the final deliverable item. Goods integrated into the deliverable item may also contain IUIDs. These items must be manually input to the IUID Registry after acceptance of the final deliverable. Need work of focus group to determine if this is the right approach.</b>

# Industry Enhancement Vote (2)

Total	Enhancement	Description
73	Initiator Comments outside the CLIN description area	Currently, EDI submissions do not have the ability to include "Comments" in a separate segment. This forces EDI users to place "FYI only" data (eg. DD250 Block 23 information) inside the Line Item description. Placing the data here puts it under DCMA approval, and it uses up valuable space in our 25-line limit. We would like a separate EDI segment on which to place such information for all WAWF EDI transactions. <i>Dave will check on it - ECP written? Priority?</i>
56	Allow WAWF to accept any valid transaction. If a payment or receiving system has a limitation, then process that transaction as paper from that point forward.	Result would be the contractor's ability to implement a standard transaction management process and submit every valid transaction (one that passes all edits for active codes, syntax, etc) to WAWF. This would eliminate the contractor's requirement to support multiple processes based on paper, WAWF, EDI, WINS, etc. Example: Corrected copies...accept a corrected transaction in WAWF, if MOCAS has already received the original, handle the correction as paper from that point forward. <i>Will review the limitations and check on it</i>
50	Remove the "suspended" process	When an invoice gets rejected from MOCAS, it goes into a "suspended" status for 24 hours before DFAS can reject it from WAWF. This is a cash flow drain to industry, as we must wait an additional 24 hours (or more when DFAS forgets) to re-submit our invoices. <i>Issue is timing - can't send the same transaction twice in one day. 24-hour delay has always been in place - in 3.0.9, we started getting notified about it. Delay is there to give someone time to investigate problem (missing RR, error in MOCAS). Vendor concern is to not let delay go beyond 24 hours. This item needs rewriting.</i>
30	Navy Ships Invoices	We can currently send our invoices through WINS but have

# Industry Enhancement Vote (3)

Total	Enhancement	Description
32	Support for decimal quantities -- including "less than 1" quantities for time-and-material invoices.	These types of invoices must currently be submitted manually, or rounded. Issue again is MOCAS not WAWF. MOCAS rehost will fix the MOCAS issue. Change contract to make unit different (example: change hours to minutes, then bill in 15-minute increments)
26	Provide Method to transmit serial numbers outside the CLIN description area	Not enough lines to transmit serial numbers in the limited descriptive text of CLIN. In addition, the printout from WAWF does not include a listing of IUIDs and their associated serial numbers. This method would need to allow the printing of the serial numbers regardless of the presence of IUIDs. Policy issue - UID may overtake this issue.
11	Create a link between a voided document and the correct one submitted in its place.	Correction process prior to acceptance requires void and re-submission. Re-submitted document does not point back to voided document; could be a problem for audit purposes.
8	On the acknowledgement email (QAR / ACO acceptance) coming back to the vendor, add a list (file names) of any attachments with this delivery or invoice.	With the requirement to send multiple supporting documents with deliveries and invoices, WAWF notifications show the documents, ABC and XYZ, were submitted as attachments. This could assist us in obtaining timely approvals on receiving reports and invoices. In